## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application.

The Examiner objected to the information disclosure statement filed December 7, 2001 for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) by not listing two co-pending US patent applications. The Applicant respectfully submits that the two co-pending US patent applications were listed in paragraph 3 of the information disclosure statement filed December 7, 2001. The Applicant notes that 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) requires that the documents be listed, but does not state where they must be listed. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the information disclosure statement filed December 7, 2001 does comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). Furthermore, MPEP Sec. 609 states that "Applicants may wish to list U.S. patent application numbers on other than a from PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08A and 08B format to avoid the application numbers being published on the patent." If the Applicant has overlooked some other aspect of the information disclosure statement to which the Examiner objects, the Applicant requests the Examiner to clarify in more detail the exact nature of the deficiency. Otherwise, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the art submitted with the information disclosure statement filed on December 7, 2001.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for having various errors. The Applicant has corrected the drawings and/or the specification as described below to overcome the examiner's objections. A replacement drawing sheet, which replaces drawing sheet 1, is attached herewith.

Specifically, FIG. 1 has need amended to correct errors in the reference signs. The specification called out packet bus 35A and 35B, while FIG. 1 only showed packet bus 35. FIG. 1 has been amended to show packet bus 35A and packet bus 35B. In addition. The specification called out computer system 5. The reference number 5 was added to FIG. 1 to identify the computer system. Further, the specification called out

peripheral buses 76, 77 and 78 being coupled to peripheral bus bridge 75. Accordingly, peripheral buses 77 and 78 were added and peripheral bus 76 was properly referenced. System memory 40 was erroneously labeled main memory 40 in FIG. 1. FIG. 1 has been amended to show system memory 40. No new matter has been added.

The remaining errors noted by the Examiner are errors of the specification and not the drawings. Specifically, number 125D was erroneously called out in the specification and Items 125A-C were erroneously described as coupled to Item 175. The drawings are correct. The appropriate description has been corrected in the specification as shown above. The number 60C was also erroneously called out in the specification. The drawings are correct. The appropriate description has been corrected in the specification as shown above. In addition, the specification erroneously omitted reference to reference number 320. The appropriate description has been corrected in the specification as shown above. In addition, the specification erroneously called out reference number 250 for two different items. The appropriate description has been corrected in the specification as shown above. Further, the appropriate descriptions of FIG. 3A and FIG. 3B have been amended to correctly describe the respective flows as shown in FIG. 3A and FIG. 3B. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 17-19, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ruszczyk (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,150) (hereinafter 'Ruszczyk'). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 4 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,330) (hereinafter 'Cidon'). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 5, 6, 9-16 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon and in further view of Drottar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,067) (hereinafter 'Drottar'). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant discloses at page 8, lines 1-7

"During operation, packet I/O bus device 50A and 50B may translate PCI bus transactions into upstream packet transactions that travel in I/O streams and additionally may translate downstream packet transactions into PCI bus transactions. All packets originating at nodes other than host node interface 30 may flow upstream to host node interface 30. All packets originating at host node interface 30 may flow downstream to other nodes such as packet I/O bus device 50A and 50B. As used herein, "upstream" refers to packet traffic flow in the direction of host node interface 30 and "downstream" refers to packet traffic flow in the direction away from host node interface 30. Each I/O stream may be identified by an identifier called a Unit ID. It is contemplated that the Unit ID may be part of a packet header or it may be some other designated number of bits in a packet or packets. As used herein, "I/O stream" refers to all packet transactions that contain the same Unit ID and therefore originate from the same node." (Emphasis added)

The Applicant further discloses at page 10, lines 8-15

"During operation, a packet transaction may enter upstream router 100. Upstream router 100 may identify the packet by the packet's Unit ID, which may be a five-bit identifier field. Upstream router 100 may assign this packet and all other packets with this same Unit ID to the first available buffer, such as upstream I/O buffer 125A. As each succeeding packet enters upstream router 100 it is examined and assigned to an appropriate buffer. Hence, all packets with the same Unit ID may be stored in the same buffer. Each upstream reorder logic circuit 150A-D may then analyze only those packets contained in the particular buffer that each receives packets from."

Accordingly, the Applicant's claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising, in pertinent part,

"a plurality of upstream buffers each configured to store a plurality of upstream packets, wherein each of said plurality of upstream packets contains an associated identifier indicative of a source of each of said plurality of upstream packets; and ...

wherein said router is configured to route each of said plurality of packets to a given one of said upstream buffers, depending upon the associated identifier."

Ruszczyk is directed toward a method of scheduling higher and lower priority data packets, wherein at col. 3, lines 50-64 Ruszczyk discloses

"The method includes a first network device monitoring a first queue with multiple data packets of varying priorities and determining scheduling priorities or transmission deadlines for data packets in the first queue. The multiple data packets provide various class-of-service and quality-of-service connections. After a first network device determines the priority of the data packets, the first network device inserts higher priority data packets into a second queue and lower priority data packets into a third queue. The data packets in the second queue are scheduled for transmission using a first scheduling method as higher priority data packets. The data packets in the third queue are scheduled by a second scheduling method with transmission deadlines as lower priority data packets to be executed after the higher priority data packets."

From the foregoing, Ruszczyk teaches placing the incoming packets into different queues based upon their respective priorities. The Applicant respectfully submits that Ruszczyk does not teach or disclose "wherein each of said plurality of upstream packets contains an associated identifier indicative of a source of each of said plurality of upstream packets." In addition, Ruszczyk does not teach or disclose "wherein said router is configured to route each of said plurality of packets to a given one of said upstream buffers, depending upon the associated identifier" as recited in the Applicant's claim 1.

Cidon is directed to fault location and performance testing of communication networks. The Applicant finds no reference, in Cidon, to "wherein each of said plurality of upstream packets contains an associated identifier indicative of a source of each of said plurality of upstream packets" or "wherein said router is configured to route each of said plurality of packets to a given one of said upstream buffers, depending upon the associated identifier" as recited in the Applicant's claim 1.

Drottar is directed to a method and apparatus for failure and recovery in a computer network. The Applicant finds no reference, in Drottar, to "wherein <u>each of said plurality of upstream packets contains an associated identifier indicative of a source of each of said plurality of upstream packets"</u> or "wherein said router is configured to

route each of said plurality of packets to a given one of said upstream buffers, depending upon the associated identifier" as recited in the Applicant's claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 1, along with its dependent claims, patentably distinguishes over Ruszczyk, over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon and over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon and in further view of Drottar for the reasons given above.

Likewise, claims 9 and 17 recite features similar to claim 1. Thus, claims 9 and 17, along with their respective dependent claims, are believed to patentably distinguish over Ruszczyk, over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon and over Ruszczyk in view of Cidon and in further view of Drottar for at least the reasons given above.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5500-66800/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen J. Curran Reg. No. 50,664

AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.

P.O. Box 398

Austin, TX 78767-0398 Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 9/16/2003



